



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

it by learning, in the national sense, to love others. Even if we were dealing with a nation like Turkey, we can feel that if we could only go to the individual Turk, free from the domination of the false ideals in which he has been brought up, we should find it possible to love the humanity in him, and by treating him justly to lift him to our own plane of living. Nothing has done more for my own education in this respect than contact with our Indian tribes,—a people at one time apparently outlawed from human sympathies, and looked upon as cruel, treacherous and bad. And yet knowledge of them shows that they too are made in the image of God, and that principles of justice and right in dealing with them will bring out splendid results. Shall we not, then, take this gospel, and spread it in all our communication with our fellow beings? Shall we not try to use our influence more and more to make the spirit of our nation the spirit of peace, and her dealings with other nations the fruit of this spirit? Shall not that be the highest and noblest idea for which the flag really stands?

Signs of Promise.

BY REV. W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—There are some signs of promise along the horizon which give us all good cheer.

One of the genuine signs of promise is the shrinking of the globe, through the progress of modern discovery and invention. I am not sure whether those “kite-flying machines” will banish war or not; it is a very interesting line of thought as to what they may do. They may take the dare-to-fight out of man; they cannot take the want-to-fight out of him. We are striving to do the latter as well as the former.

The shrinking of the globe, the drawing together of the nations, produces a physical contiguity which must have profound moral results. When General Washington went from Philadelphia to assume the command of the continental army at Boston, he was eleven days in making the journey,—a time which would now suffice to place an ambassador in most of the distant nations of the earth. When Livingstone died in the heart of Africa, it was after an absence from civilization, a practical dropping out of the world, for years. Now anyone in this room can send a telegram straight to the tree beneath which Livingstone's heart is buried. The maps of to-day are so rapidly being changed, and so marvellously, that the atlas of to-night will be practically useless at the opening of the twentieth century. We see Africa being portioned out; we see China being carved into gigantic morsels for the European palate. We see Nansen making his dash for the pole. We see the trans-continental Siberian railway carrying new life into those frozen desolations, and soon to pour the tide of European civilization into the ports of the Pacific. And this physical contiguity,—have we ever considered what it means, as regards temperamental and social and moral relations? What does it mean for men to come geographically nearer if politically and socially they are farther apart? What does it mean for men to come into greater physical proximity if they are sundered more vitally in their thoughts and ideals and aspirations? This physical nearness, on which I surely need not enlarge, means this: that in the future hatred will be more awful, strife more

frightfully disastrous, war more exceedingly terrible, peace more practicable, international amity and unity more absolutely essential, than in any century since the morning stars sang together at the creation.

Another sign of promise is the wonderful expansion of the self-consciousness of our own republic, and its frank recognition of its place among the family of nations. The first essential in the individual life is that the boy shall become strong in his own personality. The first essential is that the baby shall learn the use of “I” and “me.” First the infant must learn to walk alone and talk alone and think alone and act alone; then come those alliances with other lives, that interlacing with other personalities, out of which comes the richest and ripest part of our life. First the assertion and maintenance of one's own self, then the intertwining with other selves. So, if you ask: “Why has this great movement not before aroused the conscience of America, why was it not taken up fifty or seventy-five years ago?”—the answer is plain. First in America we had not only to declare but to achieve ourselves; first we had to achieve our own place among the nations of the earth. Now comes this larger intertwining of our national life with all the family of nations, without which our own highest well-being can never be achieved. In the history of the invention of printing, if I may borrow a happy illustration from Seth Low, progress was slow as long as the letters of a word were all printed on one block. When each movable type became absolutely independent and separate from all its fellows, then their endless combinations in modern literature and modern printing became for the first time possible. First of all it was given to this country to have the great rallying cry of 1776, Independence. Now we are coming to the grander rallying cry, because the grander idea, of Inter-dependence,—the inter-dependence of separate sovereign states, each independent in its own domain, yet all coming together in one indivisible family of nations. This, I think, is one inevitable outcome of the present tendencies and events.

Another sign of promise on the horizon is that we are now coming to recognize that the ethics of Jesus, always accepted as the supreme standard of individual righteousness, is now becoming recognized as the supreme standard of national righteousness as well. Hatred on a national scale is far more unchristian than hatred on a personal scale. Alexander Selkirk, on his lonely island, could not have been, in the deepest sense of the term, a Christian. He could of course have prayed to God and have been saved in the hereafter; but to be a Christian is very much more than that. Nine-tenths of all Christ's commands relate to our duties to our fellows, to our relations to one another; and the man who, voluntarily or involuntarily, is isolated from his fellows, cannot achieve Christianity in the real sense. The same thing is true of the nation: a nation shutting itself within its own boundaries, and saying, “We care nothing for the rest of the world, they are only our enemies,” is a nation that cannot be in the deepest sense of the term a Christian nation. How much we have to be thankful for, that the ethics of Jesus has already ameliorated the conditions of modern warfare! When, just a month ago, we issued two declarations to the world;—first, that if we go into war it shall not be for conquest and personal aggrandizement; and secondly, it shall not be to let loose a host of privateers upon our foes;—something was shown to the world which would

have been inconceivable two thousand years ago, inconceivable two hundred years ago. It was Christianity that did that. Two thousand years ago the thought was, "Injure your enemy in every possible way." There is not a nation on earth, civilized or semi-civilized, that dreams of warfare in that way to-day. The weapons of war have been changed: poisons are no longer permitted, explosive bullets are not permitted. The treatment of the sick and the wounded has been wonderfully changed; and Clara Barton to-day with the Red Cross goes amid the woes of Armenia or the starvation of Cuba, protected by her Christian womanhood and by the Christian sentiment of nations that are in deadly struggle. Non-combatants are unmolested, the rights of neutrals are respected. And all this has been done under the dominance of Christian teaching.

But we must go still farther. On the frontier, when two men fall out, they organize an extempore court and administer rough justice, hot with passion. In savage life, when two men quarrel, one knocks down his enemy, and there are no rules of the game. Under the old ridiculous "code of honor," paces were measured off, and we had the duel. Under established law those things become impossible. We have an established court, to which the differences of individuals can be referred. Now I affirm that every argument for the reference of differences between individuals to an established court in civilized lands, is an argument that tells a thousand-fold for the establishment of some court of high arbitrament among nations, to which national differences of opinion may be referred, and whose decisions shall be enforced, not by war, but by the high dignity, the evident fairness, the Christian principle, of the court itself.

The ethics of Jesus must be applied to the nations of the world. All nations are in some sense personalities. Each nation has a conscience and a will and a character, which are more than the simple sum of the wills and consciences and characters of the individuals comprising it. If in an individual magnanimity, generosity, forbearance, altruism, love, are admirable, they are a million-fold more admirable in a nation composed of a million men. If courtesy and chivalry are binding on the individual, they are much more binding on a puissant nation. If an individual ought to spring to the relief of a defenceless neighbor by his side, why may not, under Christian principle, a nation do the same thing? If the individual is bound to regard principle more than policy, bound to seek for righteousness more than the rewards of righteousness, bound to seek for justice and truth in his personal and commercial and professional relations, much more are nations bound to do the same thing. And if we who are Christians as individuals, every one of us acknowledging that the standard of Christ is the supreme norm for us,—if now we can say, that is the standard for our home, that is the standard for our village or municipality, that is the standard for our national life, then Christ shall become the Prince of Peace in a wholly new sense, and a fresh song of the angels shall be heard throughout the world.

I believe we can strive for this. Our protection is not to be found in great guns, but in the men behind the guns, in the righteousness and character within the men. Cromwell said to the English soldiers, "You boast of the great ditch that surrounds your island; but let me tell you, your ditch will not save you if you break God's

law!" We need not simply a ditch, not simply our armor-plate in time of danger. We need the protection of the pacific spirit, of the recognition of the brotherhood of nations, of the unity of the race, which shall surely cause every difficulty in time to vanish, every great obstacle in time to dwindle and fade, and shall usher in the time of which William Watson has spoken,

"When, wise from out the foolish past,
Nations shall, peradventure, hail at last
The coming of that morn divine,
When nations shall as forests grow;
Wherein the oak hates not the pine,
Nor beeches wish the cedars woe;
But all in their unlikeness blend
Confederate to one golden end."

Objections to National Wheat Granaries in Great Britain.

A letter of Mr. Edward Atkinson to a leading commercial paper of England.

BOSTON, MASS., June 23, 1898.

To the Editor of

DEAR SIR,—

Many persons have read with interest the various articles recently contributed to the press in England on the danger which the United Kingdom now incurs of a short food supply, especially of a short supply of wheat. The discussion itself brings into very conspicuous notice the interdependence of the English-speaking people. You buy from the United States fifty per cent of all that we export. Our supply of food is as necessary to you as your market is necessary to us, and yet there are a few noisy persons and presses in both countries who have been idiotic enough to promote animosity in the past and who might be so wanting in all that makes a man fit to be respected as to provoke a war between the two great branches of the English-speaking people. I do not use the word Anglo-Saxon for the reason that with a few unimportant exceptions the members of other families among the nations who have found a way to welfare in the United States are as true to the principle of liberty and of common law as if they had not been born under other conditions. There are also people of some eminence and of so little true insight into what really makes nations great as to have led them to treat commerce as if it were a pursuit inferior to that of the army and the navy; or as if armies or navies, especially the latter, would have any reason for their existence in modern times except for the protection of the commerce from which they have been generated and by which they are supported. The sea power now rests on the commerce of which navies are the national police.

We observe that plans are proposed for establishing national granaries in Great Britain in which to store a reserve of wheat, estimated to cost anywhere from fifteen to twenty million sterling,—a singular reversion to the conception of semi-barbaric conditions. Are there not easier and simpler ways to give the people of England positive assurance of the continuous supply of grain from this country, which would rot upon our fields were it not for the British market? Some of these writers are so ill informed as to anticipate a falling off in the supply from the wheat fields of America. It is only necessary to call their attention to the fact that the potential of our wheat lands has hardly been opened. Witness the